

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-14, 20 and 21 are pending, with claims 1 and 10 being independent.
Claims 15-19 are currently withdrawn from consideration.

Claim 5 has been cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 9, and 10 have been amended and claims 20 and 21 are newly added. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

Claims 1-4 and 6-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,614,026 to Williams ("Williams") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,410,558 to Izu et al. ("Izu"). Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112(2) as being indefinite.

With regard to the drawings, the Examiner indicates that Figs. 1A-1C, 2A-2B and 3 should be designated as --PRIOR ART--. The drawings have been amended accordingly. Attached hereto is a set of annotated drawings with the changes marked in red ink, along with a set of replacement sheets.

Additionally, the Examiner objected to the specification because of informalities. The amendments to the specification herein have been made to correct these minor informalities. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 112(2) as being indefinite, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 has been amended to conform with 35 U.S.C. 112(2), and requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1-4 and 6-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art in view of Williams and further in view of Izu, Applicant respectfully submits that none of the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination, contain all of the elements recited in at least the independent claims 1 and 10, as amended.

For example, amended independent claim 1 recites (emphasis added):

1. A plasma CVD apparatus comprising:
a vacuum chamber;
an exhaust means for exhausting the gas from the vacuum chamber to an outside;

an electrode for supplying an electric energy inside the vacuum chamber;
a supporting means for supporting a substrate opposing the electrode **wherein said substrate is moved in a first direction through said chamber**;
an introducing port for gas, located between the electrode and the substrate **wherein said gas is introduced into said chamber in a direction parallel with said first direction**;
wherein a plurality of openings are located on a surface of the electrode opposing the substrate,
wherein the gas is exhausted from the plurality of openings to the outside of the vacuum chamber.

In contrast, the cited prior art does not disclose or properly suggest the recited substrate and its associated movement, or the introduction of the claimed gas in a direction parallel to the substrate movement, as claimed.

Similarly, amended independent claim 10 recites (emphasis added):

10. An apparatus comprising:
a chamber;
a first electrode in the chamber;
a second electrode in the chamber;
a substrate holder to hold a substrate between the first and second electrode **wherein said substrate is moved in a first direction through said chamber**;
at least one gas inlet port to introduce a gas to a space between the substrate and the second electrode **wherein said gas is introduced in a direction parallel to said first direction**; and
a plurality of gas exhaust ports provided in said second electrode through which said gas is exhausted from said space.

Accordingly, as with claim 1, the prior art of record does not disclose or properly suggest the recited movement of the substrate relative to an introduction direction of the gas through the inlet port(s), as set forth in claim 10.

Finally, with respect to new claims 20 and 21, Applicant notes that the prior art of record does not disclose or properly suggest the "abnormal discharge preventing plate," having the characteristic(s) recited in those claims.

Applicant : Yonezawa, et al.
Serial No. : 09/820,520
Filed : March 28, 2001
Page : 10 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 07977-270001 / US4820

As independent claims 1 and 10 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above, dependent claims 2-4, 6-9, and 11-14 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons. Further, dependent claims 20 and 21 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons, as well as (as just discussed) for the reasons set forth above.


Based on the above, all of the pending claims 1-4, 6-14, 20, and 21 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is hereby requested in the Examiner's next official communication.

Enclosed is a \$110.00 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

November 25, 2003



William G. Hughes, Jr.
Reg. No. 46,112

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331
WXH/adt
40177310.doc